



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

JGJR.: 06-04

Paper No: 30

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON MA 02109

COPY MAILED

JUN 3 0 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of
Schmeidler, et al.
Application No. 09/310,294
Filing Date: 12 May, 1999
Attorney Docket No. 111283.137 US2

DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 11 June, 2004, to revive the instant application (alleging unintentional delay) under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

For the reasons set forth below, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**,

BACKGROUND

The record reflects that:

- Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 8 January, 2003, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 8 April, 2003;
- the application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 8 April, 2003;
- the Office mailed a Notice of Abandonment on 4 August, 2003;
- a Revocation Power of Attorney was filed on 18 August, 2003, and accepted by the Office on 10 November, 2003;
- with a petition alleging non-receipt and requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment (and so considered under 37 C.F.R. §1.181), Petitioner submitted a reply, in

- the form of an Amendment, but provided no support for the allegation of non-receipt, and the petition was dismissed;
- the instant petition (with fee) is accompanied by the statement of unintentional delay and a reply in the form of an Amendment.

STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).¹

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority. The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition.²

Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable.³ Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a).⁴ And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter.⁵ Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care.

By contrast, unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and

¹ 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

² Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.

³ See: *Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice*, 62 *Fed. Reg.* at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

⁴ See: *In re Application of G*, 11 USPQ2d 1378, 1380 (Comm'r Pats. 1989).

⁵ See: *Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment*, 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 33 (March 19, 1991). It was and is Petitioner's burden to exercise diligence in seeking either to have the holding of abandonment withdrawn or the application revived. See 1124 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office supra*.

regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.⁶

Allegations as to
Unintentional Delay

Petitioner has submitted a petition (with fee), accompanied by the statement of unintentional delay and a reply in the form of an Amendment.

Therefore, Petitioner has satisfied the requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) hereby is **granted**.

The instant file is forwarded to Technology Center 2700 for further processing in due course.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 305-9199.



John J. Gillon, Jr.
Senior Attorney
Office of Petitions

⁶ Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.